

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

v.

Criminal Case No: 1:11cr73

EMEKA NWOSU,  
Defendant.

**OPINION/ ORDER CONCERNING  
PLEA OF GUILTY IN FELONY CASE**

This matter has been referred to the undersigned Magistrate Judge by the District Court for purposes of conducting proceedings pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 11. Defendant, Emeka Nwosu, in person and by counsel, James Zimarowski, appeared before me on September 12, 2011. The Government appeared by Zelda E. Wesley, its Assistant United States Attorney.

Thereupon, the Court proceeded with the Rule 11 proceeding by placing Defendant under oath. The Court then inquired as to what Defendant's anticipated plea would be. The AUSA responded that Defendant would enter a plea of "Guilty" to a One-Count Information. The Court then determined that Defendant's plea was pursuant to a written plea agreement, and asked the Government to tender the original to the Court. The AUSA then summarized the agreement. Defendant then stated that the Government's summary of the Plea Agreement was correct. The Court ORDERED the written Plea Agreement filed.

Thereupon, the Court inquired of Defendant concerning his understanding of his right to have an Article III Judge hear and accept the entry of his guilty plea and his understanding of the difference between an Article III Judge and a Magistrate Judge. Defendant stated in open court that he voluntarily waived his right to have an Article III Judge hear and accept his plea and voluntarily consented to the undersigned Magistrate Judge hearing and accepting his plea, and tendered to the Court a written Waiver of Article III Judge and Consent To Enter Guilty Plea Before the United States Magistrate Judge, which

waiver and consent was signed by Defendant and countersigned by Defendant's counsel and was concurred in by the signature of the Assistant United States Attorney appearing.

Upon consideration of the sworn testimony of Defendant, as well as the representations of his counsel and the representations of the Government, the Court finds that the oral and written waiver of Article III Judge and consent to enter guilty plea before a Magistrate Judge was freely and voluntarily given and the written waiver and consent was freely and voluntarily executed by Defendant, Emeka Nwosu, only after having had his rights fully explained to him and having a full understanding of those rights through consultation with his counsel, as well as through questioning by the Court. The Court ORDERED the written Waiver and Consent filed.

The undersigned Magistrate Judge inquired of Defendant and his counsel relative to Defendant's knowledge and understanding of his constitutional right to proceed by Indictment and the voluntariness of his Consent to Proceed by Information and of his Waiver of his right to proceed by Indictment. The undersigned reviewed with Defendant the One-Count Information, including the elements the United States would have to prove at trial, charging him with conspiracy to possess with intent to distribute oxycodone hydrochloride, in violation of Title 21, United States Code, Sections 841(a)(1), 841(b)(1)(C), and 846. Defendant and his counsel then verbally acknowledged their understanding and Defendant, under oath, acknowledged his voluntary waiver of his right to proceed by Indictment and his agreement to voluntarily proceed by Information. Defendant and his counsel executed a written Waiver of Indictment. Thereupon, the undersigned Magistrate Judge received and ORDERED the Waiver of Indictment and the Information filed and made a part of the record herein.

The Court confirmed the Defendant had received and reviewed the One-Count Information in this matter with his attorney. The undersigned reviewed with Defendant the statutory penalties applicable to an individual adjudicated guilty of the felony charge contained in the One-Count Information, the

impact of the sentencing guidelines on sentencing in general, and inquired of Defendant as to his competency to proceed with the plea hearing. From said review the undersigned Magistrate Judge determined Defendant understood the nature of the charge pending against him; understood that the possible statutory maximum sentence which could be imposed upon his conviction or adjudication of guilty on that charge was imprisonment for a term of not more than twenty (20) years; understood that a fine of not more than \$1,000,000 could be imposed; understood that both imprisonment and fine could be imposed; understood he would be subject to at least three (3) years of supervised release; understood the Court would impose a special assessment of \$100.00 for the felony conviction payable at the time of sentencing; and understood that the Court may require him to pay the costs of his incarceration and supervised release.

Defendant also understood and agreed to the forfeiture of a money judgment in the amount of \$1200.00. He also understood and agreed to give information so the Government might identify and seize any other assets determined to be subject to forfeiture.

The Court then inquired of Defendant regarding his understanding of his conditional waiver of appellate rights as contained in the written plea agreement, as follows:

Ct: Did you and Mr. Zimarowski discuss that you have a right to appeal your conviction and your sentence to the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals within 14 days of the District Judge's oral pronouncement of that sentence?

Def: Yes, sir.

Ct: And did you and Mr. Zimarowski also discuss that you may also have a right to collaterally attack or challenge that sentence under Title 28 section 2255, it's commonly called habeas corpus, and how that sentence was imposed?

Def: Yes, sir.

Ct: Did you and Mr. Zimarowski discuss that under paragraph 12 of your written plea agreement, if the district judge imposes an actual sentence which is the equivalent of 12 months plus one day or less, then you give up your right to directly appeal that sentence to the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals and you give up your right to collaterally attack or challenge that sentence using habeas?

Def: Yes, sir.

Ct: Did you intend to give up those valuable appellate and collateral attack rights as outlined in paragraph 12 of your written plea agreement?

Def: Yes, sir.

Ct: And that is your own free, knowledgeable, and voluntary decision?

Def: Yes, sir.

Upon consideration of all which, the Court finds Defendant understood his appellate rights and knowingly and voluntarily waived those rights pursuant to the condition contained in the plea agreement.

Defendant thereafter stated in open court he understood and agreed with the terms of the written plea agreement as summarized by the Assistant United States Attorney during the hearing, and that it contained the whole of his agreement with the Government and no promises or representations were made to him by the Government other than those terms contained in the amended written plea agreement.

The undersigned Magistrate Judge further examined Defendant relative to his knowledgeable and voluntary execution of the written plea bargain agreement signed by him on August 25, 2011, and determined the entry into said written plea bargain agreement was both knowledgeable and voluntary on the part of Defendant.

The undersigned Magistrate Judge further inquired of Defendant, his counsel and the Government

and determined that Defendant understood, with respect to the plea bargain agreement and to Defendant's entry of a plea of guilty to the felony charge contained in the One-Count Information, the undersigned Magistrate Judge would write the subject Order and tender the same to the District Court Judge, and the undersigned would further order a pre-sentence investigation report be prepared by the probation officer attending the District Court, and only after the District Court had an opportunity to review the subject Order, as well as the pre-sentence investigation report, would the District Court make a determination as to whether to accept or reject Defendant's plea of guilty or any recommendation contained within the plea agreement or pre-sentence report.

The undersigned Magistrate Judge inquired of Defendant, his counsel, and the Government as to the non-binding recommendations and stipulation contained in the written plea bargain agreement and determined that Defendant understood, with respect to the plea bargain agreement and to Defendant's entry of a plea of guilty to the felony charge contained in the One-Count Information, the undersigned Magistrate Judge would write the subject Order and would further order a pre-sentence investigation report be prepared by the probation officer attending the District Court, and only after the District Court had an opportunity to review the pre-sentence investigation report, would the District Court adjudicate the Defendant guilty of the felony offense contained in the One-Count Information and make a determination as to whether to accept or reject any recommendation or the stipulation contained within the plea agreement or pre-sentence report. The undersigned reiterated to the Defendant that the District Judge may not agree with the recommendations or stipulation contained in the written agreement. The undersigned Magistrate Judge further advised Defendant, in accord with Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 11, that in the event the District Court Judge refused to follow the non-binding recommendations or stipulation contained in the written plea agreement and/or sentenced him to a sentence which was different from that which he expected, he would not be

permitted to withdraw his guilty plea. Defendant and his counsel each acknowledged their understanding and Defendant maintained his desire to have his plea of guilty accepted.

The undersigned Magistrate Judge further cautioned and examined Defendant under oath concerning all matters mentioned in Rule 11.

Thereupon, Defendant, Emeka Nwosu, with the consent of his counsel, James Zimarowski, proceeded to enter a verbal plea of **GUILTY** to the felony charge contained in the One-Count Information.

The Court then received the sworn testimony of City of Morgantown Police Detective David Helms, who is assigned to the Mon Valley Drug Task Force. As part of his duties he was involved in the investigation of the distribution of pills involving students at West Virginia University. He received information that Defendant and others were making trips to New Jersey to obtain pills for distribution in within the Northern District of West Virginia. Others involved included Brandon Israel, Nelson Coelho, and Michael Priolo. Pills were distributed from Defendant's residence on Willys Street, as well as another location on High Street where both Priolo and Coelho resided. There were no controlled purchases made from Defendant, but sources indicated he had made trips to New Jersey to obtain the pills to be sold in West Virginia. Further, pills were distributed from his residence. Finally, a search of the residence did turn up both pills and cash.

Defendant stated he heard, understood, and did not disagree with the officer's testimony regarding his own actions. From the testimony of Detective Helms, the undersigned Magistrate Judge concludes the offense charged in the One-Count Information is supported by an independent basis in fact concerning each of the essential elements of such offense.

Upon consideration of all of the above, the undersigned Magistrate Judge finds that Defendant is

fully competent and capable of entering an informed plea; Defendant is aware of and understood his right to have an Article III Judge hear and accept his plea and elected to voluntarily consent to the undersigned United States Magistrate Judge hearing and accepting his plea; Defendant understood his right to have his charges presented in an Indictment and knowingly, freely and voluntarily elected to proceed by Information; Defendant understood the charges against him; Defendant understood the consequences of his plea of guilty, including the statutory maximum sentence; Defendant made a knowing and voluntary plea of guilty to the One-Count Information; and Defendant's plea is independently supported by the testimony of Detective Helms, which provides, beyond a reasonable doubt, proof of each of the essential elements of the charge to which Defendant has pled guilty.

The undersigned Magistrate Judge therefore **ACCEPTS** Defendant's plea of guilty to the felony charge contained in the One-Count Information and recommends he be adjudged guilty on said charge as contained in the One-Count Information and have sentence imposed accordingly.

The undersigned further directs that a pre-sentence investigation report be prepared by the adult probation officer assigned to this case.

The Court further ORDERS Defendant be released pursuant to an Order Setting Conditions of Release to be entered this date.

The Clerk of the Court is directed to send a copy of this Order to counsel of record.

DATED: September 12, 2011.

*John S. Kaull*  
JOHN S. KAULL  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE